

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/700,284		11/03/2003	Anthony Brennan	1442.004C	4510	
23405	7590	12/09/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		BERG FARLEY &	LE, HU	LE, HUYEN D		
5 COLUMB ALBANY				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				3751		

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			///
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$N \wedge L$
	10/700,284	BRENNAN ET AL	L .
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huyen Le	3751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHER MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thi, eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered time NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	aly. communication.
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) 3 Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und 	This action is non-final. owance except for formal mat		ie merits is
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and continuous for the application. 	ndrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the continuous The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya prrection is required if the drawing	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in a priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this Nationa	ıl Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9443) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/03/2003 	-/	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (P1	ΓΟ-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/700,284 Page 2

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said first area and said second area" in 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,662,384. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the US patent includes all limitations and

Art Unit: 3751

more of claim 1 of the present invention. The difference between claim 1 of the US patent and claim 1 of the present application is that claim 1 of the US patent include " a flow control device" and claim 1 of the present application includes "at least one flow control device".

6. Claims 10-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,404. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-20 of US Patent include all limitations and more of claims 10-20 of the present application. The difference between claim 1 of the US Patent and claim 10 of the present application is that claim 1 includes "a plurality of flow control devices" and claim 10 included "a least one flow control device".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bishop (3,941,154).

The Bishop reference discloses a spa comprising an interior having an interior surface; a plurality of ports 26 located on the interior surface; a flow control device 70 comprising: a first pipe 80 including a plurality of inlets 82,84; a second pipe 104 including a plurality of outlets 74 in fluid communication with the ports; and first pipe 80

Art Unit: 3751

being movable among a plurality of positions; the flow control device 70 being configured to direct fluid to a first port in response to the first pipe 80 being moved to a first position and to the second port in response to the first pipe 80 being moved to a second position.

Regarding claim 2, one inlet is in fluid communication with one outlet through the plurality of positions.

Regarding claim 3, a first and a second area could be chest area or leg area.

Regarding claim 4, the spa comprises a third port configured to direct the fluid toward a third area of the user.

Regarding claim 5, moving the first pipe 80 of the flow control device 70 to the first position causes fluid communication of an inlet with a first outlet.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 9. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. Claims 8 and 9 are allowed.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Cordovar reference discloses a water distribution valve comprising a first pipe movable relative to a second pipe to align a plurality of inlet to the outlet of the second pipe. The Breda reference shows a multiport diverter valve comprising a first pipe movable relative to a second pipe.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,284

Art Unit: 3751

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen Le whose telephone number is 571-272-4890.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huyen Le
Examiner
Art Unit 3751

Page 5

HL December 6, 2004